# Thesis

General Strats with this CP

1. Util AC, crime + solvency debate, maybe layering with cap advantage or deont FW
2. Deont AC, meet FW with freedom + cap advantages, read util FW and crime DA
3. Critical Aff, cap advantages, patriarchy advantages

# NIT CP Shell

## A. Text

Governments should abolish any wage laws and establish a negative income tax to provide a universal basic minumum. **John Aziz**[[1]](#footnote-1) **writes**

I propose abolishing the minimum wage, and replacing it with a [basic income policy](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/17/magazine/switzerlands-proposal-to-pay-people-for-being-alive.html?hpw&rref=magazine&_r=0), a version of which was first advocated in America by [Thomas Paine](http://www.letsrun.com/forum/flat_read.php?thread=4678297). Individuals would be able to work for whatever wage they can secure, meaning that low-skilled individuals — especially the young, [who currently face a particularly high rate of employment](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/21/youth-unemployment_n_4134358.html) — would have an easier time finding work. And the level(s) of basic income could be tied to the level of productivity, to reduce inequality.There are two kinds of basic income policy. The first is a negative income tax — if an individual’s income level falls beneath a certain threshold (say, $1,500 a month) the government makes up the difference. Funds for this could be accessed by consolidating existing welfare programs like state-run pension schemes and unemployment benefits, and by closing tax loopholes and raising taxes on [corporate profits](http://www.econdataus.com/wascur_cp12.png) and high-income earners. Germany has enacted a similar policy — called the ["Kurzabeit"](http://theweek.com/article/index/253795/%20http:/economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/04/21/germanys-secrets-for-a-steadier-job-market/%20) — and it's been credited with shielding the German labor force from the worst of the recession and keeping their unemployment rate low since. The second is a universal income policy, where everyone receives a payment irrespective of their income. This would obviously require more funds — meaning higher taxes — but in a future where corporations are making larger and larger profits while requiring fewer and fewer workers [due to automation](http://azizonomics.com/2013/09/06/will-robots-drive-us-to-socialism/), such policies may become increasingly feasible. There are already very serious proposals to initiate such a scheme [in Switzerland](http://www.businessinsider.com/behind-the-swiss-unconditional-income-iniative-2013-10).

## B Competition

1. Mutually exclusive—we cant have both a living wage and an NIT because all with the LW wouldn’t qualifiy for the NIT
2. In a methods debate the question is of competing methodologies. A perm just proves my methodology is good, which isn’t a reason the aff should win.
3. There are net benefits to only doing NIT
4. I reserve the right for 2N theory on severance and intrinsic perms—my NC strat was predicated on a stable AC, and if they’re allowed to change or add on planks in the 1ar then we’ll never clash about the CP anyway

## C. Solvency

#### The NIT decreases unemployment. Humphreys 01[[2]](#footnote-2)

**The NIT supplements the wages of low income earners, removing the need for** wage regulations and **the minimum wage**. As already discussed, an elasticity of labour demand around -0.75 would provide an increase in employment of 75% for a decrease in wages of 10%. **While it would be unlikely that the competitive pressures in the labour market would allow wages to drop by such a degree, there would be some adjustment, leading to some positive employment effect.** Taking advantage of this trade off has been proposed at various times in recent years. In 1997, **Dawkins and Freebaim proposed a trade off between decreasing the real minimum wage and providing** equivalent tax credits, and advocated an eventual extension of this system into **a more complete negative income tax. This was echoed by a group of five prominent economists in an open letter to the federal government** a yar later. More recently, Des Moore, Director of the Institute of Private Enterprise has suggested that **the Government decrease the minimum wage rate (and introduce a tax credit scheme), with a possible outcome of creating 900,000 jobs.**

#### AND --- NIT decreases poverty. Humphreys 01[[3]](#footnote-3)

**A limited NIT, around 40% lower than the current level, ensures the eradication of** absolute **poverty** in Australia, provided it is delivered universally and without restrictions. Further, **the provision of the NIT to low income earners means the working poor are supported, although the greatest benefit to the poor from the NIT is a reduction in the size of the poverty trap. The NIT also allows for a lower and more constant Effective Marginal Tax Rate** (EMTR). As was previously mentioned, the current **EMTR often approaches and can sometimes exceed 100%** (that is for every $1 you ear, you lose $1 to the government). **By reducing this rate, the NIT overcomes the current disincentive to work and earn, allowing people to escape the poverty cycle. In this way, it offers a real chance for individuals to improve their wellbeing by genuinely providing the opportunity for upward mobility.**

#### Empricially verified-- Lowrey 13

Annie Lowrey (econ reporter for NYT). “Switzerland’s Proposal to Pay People for being Alive.” New York Times. November 12, 2013.   
The left is more concerned with the power of a minimum or basic income as an anti-poverty and pro-mobility tool. There happens to be some hard evidence to bolster the policy’s case. In the mid-1970s, the tiny Canadian town of Dauphin ( the “garden capital of Manitoba” ) acted as guinea pig for a grand experiment in social policy called “Mincome.” For a short period of time, all the residents of the town received a guaranteed minimum income. About 1,000 poor families got monthly checks to supplement their earnings. Evelyn Forget, a health economist at the University of Manitoba, has done some of the best research on the results. Some of her findings were obvious: Poverty disappeared. But others were more surprising: High-school completion rates went up; hospitalization rates went down. “If you have a social program like this, community values themselves start to change,” Forget said.

## D. Net Benefits

### Capitalism

#### (\_\_) The irony is, though aff tries to resist the power structure between employers, he fails to understand the greatest one is that of wages themselves. Workers sell their time and energy—they become commodities of corporations. Bracketed for gender

**Marx-** modified for gender.

Marx, Karl. “Wage Labour and Capital. Chapter 2.” Wage Labour and Capital. Web. 7 Dec. 2014.

Let us **take** any worker; for example, **a weaver. The capitalist supplies [them]** him **with the loom and yarn. The weaver applies** himself **[themself] to work, and the yarn is turned into cloth. The capitalist takes possession of the cloth and sells it for 20 shillings**, for example. Now are the wages of the weaver a share of the cloth, of the 20 shillings, of the product of the work? By no means. Long before the cloth is sold, perhaps long before it is fully woven, **the weaver has received** his **[their] wages. The capitalist**, then, **does** not **pay** his **wages** out of the money which he will obtain from the cloth, but **out of money already on hand.** Just as little **as loom and yarn are the product of the weaver** to whom they are supplied by the employer, just **so** **little are the commodities which** he **[they] receives in exchange for** his **[their] commodity – labour-power –** his **product. It is possible that the employer found no purchasers at all for the cloth.** It is possible that he did not get even the amount of the wages by its sale. It is possible that he sells it very profitably in proportion to the weaver’s wages. But all that does not concern the weaver. With a part of his [their] existing wealth, of his [their] capital, **the capitalist buys the labour-power of the weaver in exactly the same manner as**, with another part of his wealth, **he has bought the** raw material – the **yarn** – and the instrument of labour – the loom. After he has made these purchases, and among them belongs the labour-power necessary to the production of the cloth he produces only with raw materials and instruments of labour belonging to him. For our good weaver, too, is one of the instruments of labour, and being in this respect on a par with the loom, he has no more share in the product (the cloth), or in the price of the product, than the loom itself has.

“The labor” power is a form of dehumanization—they are not securing themselves but selling themselves to survive. Living wage still is a victim desperately acting to survive

Marx 2 modified for gender

Marx, Karl. “Wage Labour and Capital. Chapter 2.” Wage Labour and Capital. Web. 7 Dec. 2014.

But **the putting of labour-power into action** – i.e., the work – **is the active expression of the labourer’s own life.** And this life activity he **[they] sell**s **to another person in order to secure the necessary means of life.** His **[Their] life-activity, therefore, is but a means of securing** his **[their]** **own existence.** He works that he may keep alive. He does not count the **labour** itself as a part of his life; it **is** rather **a sacrifice of** his **[their] life. It is a commodity that** he has **[they have] auctioned off to another. The product of [their]** his **activity, therefore, is not the aim of** his **[their] activity. What [they]** he **produce**s **for** **[themselves]** himself **is not the silk** that he weaves, not the gold that he draws up the mining shaft, not the palace that he builds. **What** he **[they] produce**s **for** himself **[themselves] is wages**; and **the silk**, the gold, **and the palace are resolved for** him **[them] into a certain quantity of necessaries of life, perhaps into a cotton jacket**, into copper coins, and into a basement dwelling. **And the labourer who for 12 hours long, weaves, spins,** bores, turns, builds, shovels, breaks stone, carries hods, and so on – is this 12 hours’ weaving, spinning, boring, turning, building, shovelling, stone-breaking, regarded by him as a manifestation of life, as life? Quite the contrary. **Life for** him **[them] begins where this activity ceases, at the table, at the tavern, in bed. [They have]** The 12 hours’ work, on the other hand, has **no meaning for him *as* weaving**, spinning, boring, and so on, **but only as earnings, which enable** him **[them] to sit down at a table, to take** his **[their] seat in the tavern, and to lie down in a bed**. If the silk-worm’s object in spinning were to prolong its existence as caterpillar, it would be a perfect example of a wage-worker.

#### (\_\_) The aff’s attachment to the wage system to improve workers’ conditions entrenches capitalism

Wolff 06 – a member of the editorial board of several academic journals including *Rethinking Marxism*

(Wolff, Rick. “Anti-Slavery and Anti-Capitalism.” *Logos Journal* 5(1): 2006. <http://www.logosjournal.com/issue_5.1/wolff.htm>)

Neoclassical economic theory, among other hegemonic sets of ideas, has worked well to support and justify capitalism and undermine the appeal of Marxist economic theory. One modality of its working has been the sedimentation into the popular consciousness of the notion of “the wage.” It strikes vast numbers of people as somehow obvious, natural, and necessary that production be organized around a deal struck between a wage payer and wage receiver. And this is all the more remarkable in as much as the vast bulk of human history displays economic systems without wages (neither serfs, nor slaves, nor individuals who work alone, nor most collective work systems have used wages). Capitalism’s history is in part the history of the deepening conceptual hegemony of the wage. Thus, for example, the individual peasant or craftsperson working alone has had to be renamed a “self-employed person” to revision a non-wage production system as if it were waged. Naturalizing the wage concept works to naturalize capitalist relations of production, the employer/employee relation, not as one among alternative production systems but as somehow intrinsic to production itself. Workers, trade unions, and intellectuals often cannot imagine production without wages and hence wage payers juxtaposed to wage earners. This helps to make capitalism itself appear as necessary and eternal much as the parallel theories celebrating feudalism and slavery performed the same function for those systems of production. The naturalization of the wage system helps support the notion that the fundamental goal of workers’ organization must be to raise wages.

#### CP avoids this harm – Basic Income transforms the relationships of power within capitalist class relations – two warrants

Wright 1 Ackerman, Bruce, Anne Alstott, and Philippe Van Parijs. "Redesigning distribution." Nova Iorque: Verso (2006). Erik Olin Wright Chapter 4. Basic Income, Stakeholders Grants, and Class Analysis 80

A generous, unconditional basic income which would allow employees a meaningful exit option from the employment relation directly transforms the character of power within the class relations of capitalist society. First, in a capitalism with basic income people are free to engage in noncommodified forms of socially-productive activity, that is, productive activity which is not oriented towards the market. There is a wide range of activities which many people want to do but which are badly organized by either capitalist markets or public institutions. Prominent among these is care-giving labor – of children, of the elderly, and in many situations, of the ill. Noncommodified forms of engagement in the arts, in politics and in various kinds of community service would also be facilitated by UBI. Frequently people with serious interests in these kinds of activities would be willing to do them at relatively modest earnings if they were provided through markets – witness the very low standards of living accepted (if reluctantly) by actors, musicians, political activists, and community organizers. The problem for many people is not so much the low earnings, but the inability to find employment in these kinds of activities. Unconditional Basic Income makes it possible for people to choose to do this kind of activity without having to enter into an employment relation. It this way it contributes to a shift in the balance of power within class relations.¶ Second, for those people who still enter into ordinary capitalist employment relations, UBI would contribute to a greater symmetry of power between labor and capital even in the absence of collective organization on the part of workers. This would be particularly salient for workers in low-skilled, low wage jobs. Often workers in such jobs suffer both from low wages and from miserable working conditions. The realistic exit options of low wage workers under a UBI system would increase their bargaining power with employers. Of course, this might mean that many such low-skill jobs would disappear, but since many low-skilled people will still want discretionary income above the no-frills UBI level, there will still be potential workers willing to take such jobs. The difference is that balance of power within which the attributes of such jobs are determined would be shifted towards workers. the collective strength of workers, not just their individual leverage within employment relations. One of the factors which defines the context for the formation of working class collective organization is the extent to which unions help employers solve various kinds of problems. As has been noted in discussions of union density, there seem to be two equilibria in these terms: capitalism appears to operate best under either high union density or low union density (Calmfors and Driffill,1988; Wright, 2000). One of the contexts in which high union density is advantageous for employers is when there are chronically tight labor markets. In such situations, employers face the problem of escalating wages as firms bid up wages to poach employed workers from other firms. From the point of view of individual workers such wage escalation might seem like a good thing in the short run, but if this bidding process mean that wages rise more rapidly than productivity, then in the longer run this is unsustainable and leads to a general destabilization of capitalist labor markets. In these contexts, then, a strong labor movement can enforce wage-restraint on employers and workers in exchange for greater economic security and a more stable economic setting for productivity-enhancing technical change.

#### AND we have a prima facie ethical responsibility to resist capitalism—this means before their args

Zizek and Daly ‘4 Glyn Daly, senior lecturer in politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College Northampton, Conversations With Zizek, 2004, pp. 14-16

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gord­ian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subju­gated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture — with all its pieties con­cerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette — Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political mor­bidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of im­plicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibi­tion conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a uni­versal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its out­comes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diver­sity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and name­less (viz, the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’. And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is mag­nified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differ­ential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sus­tained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-par­ticular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

#### AND **Cap controls the internal link to long-run poverty Scott 01**

<http://www.epi.org/publication/briefingpapers_sept01inequality/> [Report](http://www.epi.org/types/report/) | [Trade and Globalization](http://www.epi.org/issues/trade-and-globalization/) The unremarkable record of liberalized tradeAfter 20 years of global economic deregulation, poverty and inequality are as pervasive as ever By [Robert E. Scott](http://www.epi.org/people/robert-e-scott/), [Christian E. Weller](http://www.epi.org/people/christian-e-weller/), and [Adam S. Hersh](http://www.epi.org/people/adam-s-hersh/) | October 1, 2001

While many social, political, and economic factors contribute to poverty, the evidence shows that unregulated capital and trade flows contribute to rising inequality and impede progress in poverty reduction. Trade liberalization leads to more import competition and to a growing use of the threat to move production to lower-wage locales, thereby depressing wages. Deregulated international capital flows have led to rapid increases in short-term capital flows and more frequent economic crises, while simultaneously limiting the ability of governments to cope with crises. Economic upheavals disproportionately harm the poor, and thus contribute to the lack of success in poverty reduction and to rising income inequality

### Freedom

#### Societal requirements to cause people to work is a form of coercions—only the CP can solve. Danaher 15 explicates Maskivker

Condition (a) is all about the need for an ability to choose how to use our time. Maskivker defends this requirement by starting out with a Lockean conception of freedom, one that is often beloved by libertarians. The Lockean conception holds that individuals are free in the sense that they have self-ownership. That is to say: they have ownership rights over their own bodies, and the fruits of their labour. This fundamental right of self-ownership in turn implies a bundle of other rights (e.g. the right to transfer the fruits of one’s labour to another). Any system of political authority must respect this fundamental right and its necessary implications. The problem for Maskivker is that many fans of self-ownership limit themselves to a formal, rather than an effective, conception of that right. In other words, they simply hold, in the abstract, that individuals have this right of self-ownership and that they should not be interfered with when exercising it. They don’t think seriously about what it would take to ensure that everybody was really able to effectively enjoy this right. If they did this, they would realise that there are a number of social and evolutionary imbalances and injustices in the ability of individuals to exercise self-ownership. They would realise that, in order to effectively enjoy the right, individuals will also need access to resources. Now, to be fair, some writers do recognise this. And they highlight the need for things like adequate education and healthcare in order for the right to self-ownership to be effective. Maskivker agrees with their approach. The originality of her contribution comes in its insistence on the importance of time as an essential resource for self-ownership. Time is, in many ways, the ultimate resource. Time is necessary for everything we do. Everything takes time. Other skills and abilities that we may have, only really have value when we have the time to exercise them. Furthermore, time is a peculiarly non-manipulable resource. There is a limited amount of time in which we get to act out our lives. This makes it all the more important for people to have access to time. You can probably see where this is going. The problem with work is that it robs us of time. We need jobs in order to live, and they take up most of our time. Some people argue that the modern realities of work are particularly insidious in this regard. Jonathan Crary, in his slightly dystopian and alarmist work, [24/7: Late Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep](http://www.amazon.co.uk/24-Late-Capitalism-Ends-Sleep-ebook/dp/B00G2DOB1S/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1422747952&sr=8-1&keywords=24%2F7), notes how work has colonised our every waking hour and how it threatens to colonise our sleep too. We are encouraged to make our time more productive, but also to be available to our workplaces at more times of the day, through email or social media. Indeed, the slow death of the regular 9-to-5 workday has, if anything, encouraged work to monopolise more of time. We have flexible working hours and our work may be more outcome-driven, but the marketplaces are open 24/7 and they demand more outcomes from us. The result is an infiltration of work into every hour of the day. Some people may not resent this. They may feel that they are living the kind of life they wish to live, that their work is enjoyable, and that it gives them a sense of purpose. But others will feel differently. They will feel that work takes away valuable opportunities to truly express themselves as they wish. In sum, access to time and the time-limiting nature of work, is one thing to think about when designing a scheme of distributive justice. An ability to opt out of work, or to have much less of it in one’s lives may be necessary if we are to have a just society. 3. Freedom and Authorship of One’s LifeThere is a related argument to made here about the ability to choose one’s time. It can be connected to Maskivker’s account of effective self-ownership, but it can also be separated from it. That’s what condition (b) is about. It appeals to a distinctive notion of freedom as being the ability to exercise true authorship over one’s life. This is a slightly more metaphysical ideal of freedom, one that joins up with the debate about free will and responsibility. To understand the idea, we need to think more about the individual who truly enjoys their work. As I suggested at the end of the previous section, you could argue that there is nothing unjust about the current realities of work for such an individual. Granting them more free time, won’t really help them to exercise more effective self-ownership. They are getting what they want from life. Take me for example. I have already said that I enjoy my work, and I have been able to (I think) select a career that best suits my talents and abilities. I’m pretty sure I’m employing the scarce resource of time in a way that allows me to maximise my potential. I’m pretty sure there is nothing fundamentally unjust or freedom-undermining about my predicament. Nevertheless, Maskivker wants to argue that there is something fundamentally unjust about my predicament. My freedom is not being respected in the way that it should. Despite all my claims about how much I enjoy my work, the reality is that I have to work. I have no real say in the matter. She uses an analogy between starving and fasting to make her point. When a person is starving or fasting, the physical results are often the same: their bodies are being deprived of essential nutrients. But there is something morally distinct about [fasting and starving] the two cases. The person who fasts has control over what is happening to their body. The person who is starving does not. The person who chooses to fast has authorship over their lives; the person who is starving is having their story written by someone else. When it comes to our work, there is a sense in which we are all starving not fasting. We may enjoy it, embrace it and endorse it, but at the end of the day we have to do it. That’s true even in societies with generous welfare provisions, as most of those welfare provisions are conditional upon us either looking for work (and proving that we are doing so), or being in some state of unavoidable disability or deprivation. We are not provided us with an “easy out”, or with the freedom we need to become the true authors of our lives. (Maskivker notes that the introduction of a universal basic income could be a game-changer in this regard).

#### AND specifically the living wage is coercive—it demands full-time labor just to ensure a decent livelihood. Danaher 2

How does this apply to Maskivker’s anti-work argument? Very simply. She claims that work, in the modern world, involves an exploitative bargain. There is no particular agent behind this exploitation. Rather, it is the broader society, with its embrace of the work ethic and its commitment to the necessity of work, that renders the decision to work exploitative: “Demanding fulltime work in exchange for a decent livelihood is comparable to demanding an exorbitant price for a bottle of water in the absence of competition. It leaves the individual vulnerable to the powerful party (society) in the face of the great loss to be suffered if the “offer” as stipulated is not taken (if one opts not to work while not independently wealthy)”

### Crime

#### **Minimum wage increases are empirically shown to increase crime in 14-30 year olds by 1.9 %. Beuchamp 12**[[4]](#footnote-4)**. Bracketed for grammar**

Did raising the minimum wage increase[d] crime in the United States over the past 15 years? The evidence we present suggests the answer is yes. Further, our results indicate that this increase in crime occurs across the board, with increases in theft, drug sale, and violent crime. Among the employed these increases appear occur due to a decrease in labor income from reduced work. Effects are particularly large for low-skilled workers with prior criminal connections. ¶ Our results highlight the importance of providing employment opportunities for young, unskilled- youth given the evidence for a relationship between licit and illicit work. They also point to the dangers both to the individual and to society from policies that restrict the already limited employment options of this group. Our results indicate that crime will increase by 1.9 percentage points among 14-30 year-olds as the minimum wage increases, with effects being even larger among teenagers. With an average overall crime rate at 12.1%, this is a substantial increase. The social costs to raising the minimum wage may not appear in net employment or unemployment changes, but nonetheless appear non-trivial. ¶

End quote. Crime outweighs <INSERT AFF IMPACT>  
  
1) Crime is an irreversible impact because you can’t uncommit a crime but you can fix <INSERT AFF IMPACT>.

2) Crime controls the internal link into poverty because a) it literally involves stealing b) victims can’t work or are less productive c) criminals can’t work because they are in prison or are less likely to get jobs because they are ex-convicts and d) it perpetuates poverty as a whole since it furthers the system of haves and have-nots and focuses on some individuals overpowering others and impoverishing them more.

3) Crime in any sense is a gateway, and a recidivism rate over 75%[[5]](#footnote-5) means that A) the exact same crime impacts keep happening over and over again while your impacts just happen once or are a state of being and B) recidivating criminals commit gradually worse crimes, so nonviolent crime has a key link to all crime.

4) Systematic harms outweigh extinction

1. Magnitude: crime happens every day and affects millions of people yearly in the US. I’ll prove lack of brink on your extinction scenario meaning we don’t know when the neg impact will be triggered but we do know that the aff impact is aggregating everyday, meaning the magnitude will be comparable by the time your scenario occurs.
2. Time frame- violent crimes happen every day and create irreversible harms to people, i.e. we can’t unmurder a victim. Prefer impacts that happen on a shorter timeframe since there’s a chance intervening actors can solve your problems, whereas my impact can’t be reversed.
3. Probability—extinction isn’t likely to happen but crime is 100% guaranteed to happen. Prefer high probability impacts to low probability high magnitude impacts to prevent policy paralysis—otherwise, every policy action will always focus on the big magnitude and not address issues happening every day that affect millions of citizens. And, given that there are multiple competing big impacts scenarios, paralysis occurs because we don’t know which one to prevent first.

### Patriarchy

#### The concept of “living wage” relies on the “male breadwinner” model of the family-the aff’s representation of the living wage as necessary to provide independence reinforces gender stereotypes and exclusion.

Grover 5 Chris Grover (Professor at Lancaster University) “Living wages and the ‘making work pay’ strategy” Critical Social Policy Vol. 25(1): 5—27, 2005 <http://csp.sagepub.com/content/25/1/5.short>

Second, the idea of need is problematic in living wages because of its close association with the concept of the family wage. This issue is recognized in sections of the living wage movement (Brenner, 2002), but has yet to be overcome. This means that living wages are premised upon an androcentric view of wage structures: that a male breadwinner should be able to earn the majority of income for his spouse and dependent children. This is the case in living wages, because, as we have seen, there is an expectation that there will be a full time worker in households. While there is care in living wage literature not to assign this role to men, it is difficult to see how the assumptions of living wages will break from the male breadwinner model. What this means in practice is that living wages can only meet the needs of workers and their families if they conform to the male breadwinner model. Hence, the difficulties demonstrated in Table 1 with delivering higher than the ‘making work pay’ strategy incomes to lone-mother-headed households. If wages were related as closely to need as it is sometimes portrayed in arguments for living wages, those people with dependent children, those working part time and those in families with only one earner would be paid a higher hourly wage compared to those families without dependent children, those with full time earners and those with multiple earners. In other words, those workers who do not conform to the male breadwinner model have potentially the most to gain financially from living wages, but under current proposals they would actually gain the least

#### The wage system excludes women-linking employment to income hides the contributions of women to the economy.

Pateman 87 Carol Pateman (Professor of Government at the University of Sydney) “The Patriarchal Welfare State: Women and Democracy.” 1987  
The investigation of women's standard of living independently from men's also seems unnecessary given the conventional understanding of the "wage." The concept of the wage has expressed and encapsulated the patriarchal separation and integration of the public world of employment and the private sphere of conjugal relations. Once the opposition breadwinner/housewife was consolidated, a 11 wage 11 had to provide subsistence for several people. However, in arguments about the welfare state and the social wage, the wage is usually treated as a return for sale of individuals' labor power. Instead, the struggle between capital and labor and the controversy about the welfare state has been about the family wage. A "living wage” has been defined as what is required for a worker as breadwinner to support a wife and family, rather than what is needed to support himself; the wage is not what is sufficient to reproduce the worker's own labor power, but what is sufficient, in combination with the unpaid work of the housewife, to reproduce the labor power of the present and future labor force.

#### Patriarchal Domination is the root cause of all forms of domination. Systemic dehumanization, famine, ecological devastation and nuclear warfare are all inevitable in a world of patriarchy

Hooks 89 bell hooks (American author, feminist and social activist, Professor of English at City College in NY) Talking Back: Thinking Feminist – Thinking Black pp. 19-20 1989  
We live in a world in crisis—a world governed by politics of domination, one in which the belief in a notion of superior and inferior, and its concomitant ideology—that the superior should rule over the inferior—effects the lives of all people everywhere, whether poor or privileged, literate or illiterate. Systematic dehumanization, worldwide famine, ecological devastation, industrial contamination, and the possibility of nuclear destruction are realities which remind us daily that we are in crisis. Contemporary feminist thinkers often cite sexual politics as the origin of this crisis. They point to the insistence on difference as that factor which becomes the occasion for separation and domination and suggests that differentiation of status between females and males globally is an indication that patriarchal domination of the planet is the root cause of the problems. Such an assumption has fostered the notion that elimination of sexist oppression would necessarily lead to the eradication of all forms of domination. It is an argument that has led influential Western white women to feel that feminist movement should be the central political agenda for females globally. Ideologically, thinking in this direction enables Western women, especially privileged white women, to suggest that racism and class exploitation are merely the offspring of the parent system: patriarchy. Within feminist movement in the West, this has led to the assumption that resisting patriarchal domination is a more legitimate feminist action that resisting racism and other forms of domination. Such thinking prevails despite radical critiques made by black women and other women of color who question this proposition. To speculate that an oppositional division between men and women existed in early human communities is to impose on the past, on these non-white groups, a world view that fits all too neatly within contemporary feminist paradigms that name man as enemy and woman as the victim.

#### Their epistemology is fundamentally flawed and inaccessible to women making the rejection of patriarchy a prerequisite to their impacts—we can’t solve their impact with half the population.

Peterson 5 V. Spike Peterson (Professor at the Department of Political Science at University of Arizona) “How (the Meaning of) Gender Matters in Political Economy” New Political Economy, Vol. 10, No. 4, December 2005   
From more constructivist and especially poststructuralist starting points, gender is understood as a governing code and its inclusion in our analyses necessarily has epistemological / theoretical implications. On this view, gendering political economy entails a questioning of orthodox methods and foundational inquiries in so far as these rely on gendered assumptions and biases. This raises the theoretical stakes dramatically: it threatens to be systemically disruptive, which decreases receptivity and increases resistance to more complex understandings of gender. It is important to note that, in the absence of constructivist or poststructuralist insights, the meaning of operational ‘codes’ (gender or otherwise) is neither obvious nor readily comprehended. Hence, the systemic, intellectually transformative work of feminists is effectively ‘invisible’ because it exceeds what the mainstream can see or comprehend through positivist / modernist lenses. In this sense, the marginalisation of constructivism and poststructuralism in economics, political economy and IPE significantly limits how gender is understood, and goes some way in explaining both the variation among feminists and the relatively superficial engagement of non-feminists, who cannot (or do not want to) ‘see’ the profound implications of taking gender seriously. In other words, epistemological commitments shape receptivity to feminist work, and especially which feminist insights / claims are deemed comprehensible, acceptable and / or compelling

#### The CP fights against the patriarchy by breaking the link between employment and income, and by ending the mutual reinforcement of gender roles between employment and marriage.

#### Pateman 4 Carol Pateman (Professor of Government at the University of Sydney) “Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income” Politics and Society Vol. 32 No. 1 March 2004 pp. 89-105

The second consequence, and a crucial difference between basic income and stakeholding, is that a basic income would give citizens the freedom not to be employed. Both a basic income, if set at the appropriate le v el, and a capita l grant w ould pro vide enlar ged opportunities for indi viduals, b ut the opportuni ties pro - vided by a basic income w ould be f ar wider than those of fered by a stak e, sinc e the ne w opportunities w ould not be conf ined to the competiti v e mark et. A basic income, lik e a stak e, w ould mak e it possible for an yone (at an y point in their life, not merely while the y are young) to go back to school, to retrain for a new occupation, or to open a business. But a basic income pro viding a modest but decent standard of li ving would do much more. In The Constitution of Liberty , Friedrich v on Hayek —lik e G. D. H. Cole from a v ery dif ferent point on the political spectrum—argued that emplo yment fostered an outlook among emplo yees that w as an impediment to freedom. The emplo yed , he wrote, are “in man y respects . . . alien and often inimical to much that constitutes the dri ving force of a free society . ” 20 His solution w as that there should be as man y gentlemen of pri v ate means as possible to counteract the deleterious ef fect of emplo yment. In ef fect, such gentlemen ha v e lar ge basic incomes, albeit not pro vided by a go v ernment. At a v ery much lo wer le v el of resources a basic income democratizes the freedom open to a gentlemen of pri v ate means to spend time in scholarly pursuits, good w orks, writing poetry , culti v ating friendships, hunting, or being a drone or a w astrel. A basic income w ould allo w indi viduals at an y t ime to do v oluntary or political w ork, for e xample, to learn to surf, to write or paint, to devote themselves to family life, or to ha v e a quiet period of self-reassessment or contemplation. By opening up this range of opportunities and uncoupling income and standard of life from employment, a basic income has the potential both to encourage critical reassessment of the mutually reinforcing structures of marriage, employment, and citizenship and to open the possibility that these institutions could be remade in a ne w , more democratic form. A capital grant gi v en to young people with the aim of assisting indi vidual economic success lacks the same poten tial. In The Stak eholder Society , Ack erman and Alstott ar gue that a stak e encourages indi viduals, in a w ay that a basic income cannot, to reflect upon what the y w ant to do with their li v es, and appraise their situation. “Ci vic reflection” and attention to “the f ate of the nation” become possible when economic anxieties are lifte d. 21 A “purer form of patriotism” will arise out of the “simple gratitude to the na tion” that citizens will feel as the y think about their capital grant and the debt that the y o we to their country for the economic citizenship that comes with stak eholding . 22 P atriotism and gratitude, ho we v er , ha v e only a tenuous connection to indi vid - ual freedom. Pro vision of a one-time capital grant will no doubt encourage indi - viduals to consider what courses of action are open to them, and might e v en f oster reflection on the debt the y o we to their country . But it seems implausible t hat it would help promote reflection on the political implications of the structural connections between marriage, employment, and citizenship. Both the wide v a riety of opportunities made possible when emplo yment becomes truly voluntary and the f act that women ’ s freedom would be greatly enhanced mean that, unlik e a stak e, a basic income has the potential to open the door to institutional change— pro viding that democratization is at the forefront of discussion and that feminist ar guments are tak en seriously . The freedom not to be emplo yed runs counter to the direction of much recent public polic y and political rhetoric (especially in Anglo-American coun tries, though the policies are international), and this mak es stak eholding more palatable than basic income in the current political climate. The ef fect of such poli cies and rhetoric is to dra w e v en tighter the long-standing link between emplo ymen t and citizenship, at the v ery time when a reassessment has been made possible by changing circumstances. The institution of emplo yment is a barrier to dem ocratic freedom and citizenship in tw o w ays. First, economic enterprises ha v e an u ndemocratic structure, a point that I shall not pursue here. 23 Second, as feminist scholars ha v e demonstrated, the relationship between the institutions of marriage, employment, and citizenship has meant that the standing of wives as citizens has al w ays been, and remains, problematic. The Anglo-American social insurance system w as constructed on the assump tion that wives not only were their husbands ’ economic dependents but lesser citizens whose entitlement to benefits depended on their private status, not o n their citizenship. Male “breadwinners, ” who made a contrib ution from their ear nings to “insure” that the y recei v ed benef its in the e v ent of unemplo yment or sickn ess, and in their old age, were the primary citizens. Their emplo yment w as treated a s the contrib ution that a citizen could mak e to the well-being of the community . Ack erman and Alstott ackno wledge this in their criticism of “w orkplace jus - tice, ” 24 and their recognition that unconditional retirement pensions w ould be pa r - ticularly important for the man y older w omen whose benef its still lar gely deri v e from their husbands ’ emplo yment record. 25 That is to say , only paid emplo yment has been seen as “w ork, ” as in v olving the tasks that are the mark of a product i v e citizen and contrib utor to the polity . Other contrib utions, notably all the work required to reproduce and maintain a health y population and care for inf ants, the elderly , the sick, and inf irm—the caring tasks, most of which are not paid for and are undertaken by women—ha v e been seen as irrelevant to citizen ship

# Solvency Turns

## Solvency Deficits

#### (\_\_) The problem for low-income workers is not insufficient wages but insufficient hours.

Carl F. Horowitz, [Consultant on labor, welfare reform, immigration, and housing, former policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation], “Keeping the Poor Poor: The Dark Side of the Living Wage,” Cato Institute Policy Analysis No. 493, 21 October 2003.

Advocates of the living wage argue that it combats poverty, but the evidence does not support that claim. First, the problem for low-income Americans is really insufficient hours rather than insufficient wages. A Bureau of Labor Statistics report revealed that in 2000 only 3.5 percent of all household heads who worked full-time 27 weeks or more over the course of the year fell below the poverty line. By contrast, this figure was 10.2 percent for household heads who worked less than 27 weeks.23 The BLS study also revealed that only a few more than 20 percent of all household heads with below-poverty-line incomes attributed their condition solely to low earnings. The remaining 80 percent cited unemployment, involuntary part-time employment, or one or both of those factors in combination with low earnings. In addition, the Census Bureau reported that the median income in 1999 for household heads working full-time year-round (50 weeks or more) was $55,619. By contrast, household heads working full-time 27 to 49 weeks had a median income of only $38,868, and for those who worked full-time 26 weeks or less the figure was $26,001.24 An Employment Policies Institute analysis of 1995 Census Current Population Survey data concluded that only 44 percent of minimum wage employees worked full time.25

End quote. This means that even if LW are an effective policy tool, free market will dictate the tool gets limited use, ie, employers will reduce hours for their employees.

#### (\_\_) Living wage fails to target those actually in poverty. 72% of those benefiting from living wage are not poor. Lammam 14[[6]](#footnote-6)

And contrary to what advocates claim, living wage policies are not the answer to the hardships experienced by many impoverished families. The available evidence shows that living wage laws generally do not help the most poverty-ridden families, in part because the overwhelming proportion of those benefitting from living wage laws tend not be poor. One study reviewed in this report found that 72% of those benefitting from living wage laws were not actually poor. Advocates also tend to overstate the overall effect of living wage laws upon the income of workers whose wages are positively affected. While living wage legislation may make them better off in terms of labour market earnings, research shows they will experience a countervailing effect due to reduced eligibility for benefits from government social programs. The net increase in income is therefore less than expected.

But NIT uniquely solves because everyone has the safety net of a basic income regardless of employment status or hours

## Solvency Turns

#### (\_\_) Minimum wage laws cause rampant unemployment and poverty increases-this disproportionately affects the worst off--every credible study goes neg. Wilson 12 Mark Wilson (Principal at Applied Economic Strategies, 25 years of economic policy experience, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards Administration at the U.S. Department of Labor, Research Fellow at The Heritage Foundation specializing in workplace policy and tax issues) “The Negative Effects of Minimum Wage Laws” Policy Analysis No. 701 June 21st 2012

Proposals to increase the minimum wage can be politically popular because they are viewed as being a way of helping the poor. However, evidence from a large number of academic studies suggests that minimum wage increases don’t reduce poverty levels. Some of the reasons include ● Many [63.5% of]poor Americans (63.5%) do not work, and thus aren’t earning wages. 41 ● Even among the working poor, the relationship between earning a low hourly wage rate and living in pov- erty is weak and has become weaker over time. That is because most work- ers who gain from a minimum wage increase live in nonpoor families and most of the working poor already have wages above the required minimums. 42 ● While an increase in the minimum wage will lift some families out of pov- erty, other low-skilled workers may lose their jobs, which reduces their income and drops their families into poverty. 43 ● If a minimum wage is partly or fully passed through to consumers in the form of higher prices, it will hurt the poor because they disproportionately suffer from price inflation. 4 Relatively few poor households would ben- efit from a minimum wage increase even if there were no negative employment or other affects. In the recent federal minimum wage in- crease from $5.15 to $7.25, only 15.8 percent of the workers who were expected to gain from it lived in poor households. 45 In the current pro- posal to raise it to $9.50, only 11.3 percent of the workers who would gain live in poor house- holds. 46 And of those who would gain, 63 per- cent are second or third earners living in house- holds with incomes twice the poverty line . Since 1995, eight studies have examined the income and poverty effects of minimum wage increases, and all but one have found that past minimum wage hikes had no effect on poverty. 47 One recent academic study found that both state and federal minimum wage increases between 2003 and 2007 had no effect on state poverty rates. 48 These studies generally find that some low-skilled workers iving in poor families who remain employed do see their incomes rise. However, other low- skilled workers lose their jobs or have their work hours substantially reduced, which causes income losses and increased poverty. On net, some studies find that the families of low-skilled workers and less-educated single mothers are no better off and may be made worse off by minimum wage hikes. 49 The up- shot is that there is no free lunch to this sort of top-down mandated attempt at reducing poverty

#### (\_\_)The AC uniquely kills jobs. Living wage reduces employment by 5% generally and 12% in the lowest decile of the wage distribution. Adams and Neumark 04

#### Adams and Neumark ‘04[[7]](#footnote-7)

Of course, the potential gains from higher wages may be offset by reduced employment opportunities. We use the same basic empirical framework to study employment, with only two differences. First, we estimate linear probability models for individual employment status. Second, we cannot classify non-working individuals based on their position in the wage distribution. Instead, we impute wages for everyone and group individuals based on their position in the distribution of imputed wages, or “skills.” For living wages generally, we find an estimated disemployment effect that is significant at the five-percent level at a lag of 12 months for those in the bottom tenth of the imputed wage distribution, paralleling the wage results. The regression coefficient of −0.053 in Table 2 is from a regression of the employment rate on the log of the living wage. Thus, the estimate implies that a one log unit increase in the living wage reduces employment by 5.3 percentage points. Given an employment rate of 43.4 percent in the lowest decile of the imputed wage distribution, this represents a 12 percent employment reduction, or a −0.12 elasticity. When we estimate separate effects of business assistance and contractor-only living wage laws, both estimates are negative, but we find a significant disemployment effect only for business assistance living wage laws, with an elasticity of –0.17, and a much smaller (and insignificant) estimate for contractor-only laws.

A living wage will make it harder for workers to find jobs and contribute to the economy.

*Mark* ***Adams 13*** *[A research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University], "Raising the Minimum Wage Hurts the Poor, US News, March 11, 2013, GHS//MM*

The minimum wage is more likely to hurt the people it is supposed to help by making it harder for them to find jobs.¶ [See a collection of political cartoons on Congress.]¶ Minimum wage workers tend be young and unskilled. Less than half of workers under the age of 25 are currently employed and many rely on low paying opportunities to get their first break. The majority will earn a raise within a year, but they currently lack the experience and skill to compete for higher paying jobs. Raising the minimum wage makes it harder for these inexperienced workers to find a job, because businesses will either eliminate positions or choose to hire someone with more experience at the higher mandated wage. Minimum wage jobs could also be a pathway to retraining for workers facing a mismatch between their skills and available openings. A higher minimum wage would limit such opportunities, and that's particularly dangerous during this historically slow recovery¶ If policymakers really want to help the poor, they should seek to reduce the barriers to job creation, instead of adding to them by hiking minimum wage. Job creators are already tangled in a forest of red tape: over 170,000 pages of regulations from the federal government alone. Complying with these regulations is disproportionately burdensome for the small businesses that create the majority of new jobs.¶

If there’s empirics on both side of the debate, default tiebreaking with analytic causality—this lets us know that the results found aren’t conflating correlation with causation

AND Employment reduces poverty.

Blake **Bailey**, “How to Not Be Poor,” National Center for Policy Analysis. Jan 15, 20**03**.

Working also significantly reduces long-term poverty. According to an analysis of the Census Bureau's Survey of Income and Program Participation, 10.8 percent of adults who do not work are poor over the long term. In contrast, only 1.7 percent of those employed part time stay poor for extended periods. People employed full time have a 0.4 percent chance of long-term poverty. Moreover, the government can encourage behavioral changes. Research shows that between one-third and one-half of the fall in poverty among single mothers on welfare after 1994 was due to the 1996 welfare reforms that encouraged work.

AND don’t let aff say poverty empirics already control for unemployment because the studies are localized to individual economies where a) employment could leak into other non-living wage sectors and b) national policymaking hasn’t made effect. This means we have good reason to believe when the plan passes, unemployment will cause more poverty

#### (\_\_)Minimum wage increase leads to higher prices for the poor. Leong[[8]](#footnote-8) 13

The real problem is that other lower-wage-paying companies, such as McDonalds Corporation (NYSE/MCD), simply won’t absorb wage increases without passing the increase on to their customers. And there’s absolutely nothing illegal in this. It’s a fact: an increase in wages equals an increase in the price of goods. Think of it this way: when a company is forced to pay its minimum-wage employees a higher wage, the company needs to allocate more money toward payroll. With an increase in wage costs, that company now needs to find a new way to increase earnings so that it can cover this increase. Raising the price of its goods is an obvious answer for the company. For instance, the cost of a $3.00 “Big Mac” rises to $3.25 following an increase in minimum wage. By boosting the minimum wage, the lower-wage earners may make more, but it will be partly offset by higher costs [increase] for end goods, such as those at Wal-Mart and McDonald’s, which are stores the lower-income earners may be more inclined to shop or eat at. Moreover, increasing the minimum wage will mean higher input costs at manufacturing plants across the nation. These manufacturing plants will then have two options: 1) raise the price of the end product; or 2) move part or all of their manufacturing to cheaper labor markets in places like Asia and Latin America. I suspect some companies will look more seriously at the latter option; and we all know China and Mexico would welcome $2.00-per-hour plant jobs. So before we just implement higher wages, we need to put more thought into the process; we need to consider what detrimental affects higher wages could have on America’s economy and its position in the broader economy, as a wage increase could easily hurt the competitiveness of the country in the global market

#### (\_\_) Companies will cut other forms of compensation to their workers, leaving them worse financially. Baird ‘02

Baird 02 Charles, a professor of economics and the director of the Smith Center for Private Enterprise Studies at California State University at Hayward, “The Living Wage Folly,” Ideas on Liberty, June 2002, pp. 16-19.

Sometimes profit-seeking entrepreneurs will try to avoid layoffs by cutting nonwage compensation paid to workers. For example, reductions in paid vacation time; employer contributions to retirement funds, employer paid medical insurance, and rates of sick leave accrual can sometimes offset the effect of a higher legal minimum wage. If so, affected workers will keep their jobs, but they will not be any better off than they were before the minimum-wage increase. In fact, they will probably be worse off because more of their compensation will be taxable than before.

(\_\_)Minimum wage forces cuts to other benefits – net increase in poverty Lamman 14  
Fraser 14 Charles Lammam. “The Economic Effects of Living Wage Laws.” Fraser Institute. January 2014 AJ

Minimum wage policies have other unintended consequences. Evidence shows that employers not only respond to a minimum wage floor by decreasing the number of jobs, but they also cut back on hours (Couch and Wittenburg, 2001), provide less on-the-job training and other non-wage benefits (Neumark and Wascher, 2001; Marks, 2011), and give employment priority to their most productive and experienced workers (Neumark and Wascher, 1995). There is also a growing body of evidence that shows minimum wage increases actually do little to help households in need. One recent study exam- ined increases in the minimum wage across Canadian provinces from 1981 to 2004 and actually found that raising the minimum wage was associated with a four- to six-percent increase in the percentage of families living below Statistics Canada’s low income cut-off (LICO) line (see Sen et al., 2011). In a 2012 study by renowned Canadian minimum-wage researchers, Michele Campolieti, Morley Gunderson, and Byron Lee, the authors analyzed prov- incial data from 1997 to 2007 and found that raising the minimum wage had no statistically discernible impact on measures of relative poverty including LICO (Campolieti et al., 2012). One important reason for these findings is that the bulk of those working for minimum wage do not actually belong to low-income households. In a 2009 study, researchers used Statistics Canada data to profile minimum-wage earners in Ontario. They found that “over 80 of low-wage earners are not members of poor households” and that “over 75 of poor households do not have a member who is a low-wage earner” (Mascella et al., 2009: 373).19

# NIT Frontlines

## A2 Perm

1. Can’t do both—extend the plank of abolish all wage floors. Even if you don’t buy conceded mutual exclusivity, that plank is necessary to make sure people can do whatever job they want and still make a living. But if firms have to pay out a high minimum like the living wage, then it discourages them from hiring. This means the world of the perm is worse than the world of the CP
2. He’s severing from his advocacy which was to give a living wage and not to pay unemployed workers. Severance perms are voters a) my CP was predictated on a stable AC advocacy of not paying unemployed workers, allowing him to change allows him to moot the value of any CP b) if aff is allows to sever out of planks of the AC then he’ll never have to clash with the CP or discuss the net benefits of it. That kills both the educational point of running CPs and fairness because it means we don’t get to talk about what we’re most prepped on. Particularly inexcusable at TOC because aff had 5 months to respond to NIT fairly
3. There are net benefits to only doing the CP. His perm doesn’t solve \_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_
4. Don’t vote aff unless there’s a net benefit to the perm. If both the perm and the CP come out even, vote neg because a) you’re voting for my methodology, that’s not a reason to affirm and b) key to neg flex and engaging the aff substantively—if aff can win without net benefits to the perm then neg will always be at a disadvantage because it can’t engage the aff in as many ways
5. Interpretation—if aff makes a perm to an NIT CP that says to give the living wage to the employed and the NIT to the unemployed, then he must either provide in the AC or 1AR perm text how much the living wage is. He violates by not quantifying how much a living wage is. The standard is shiftiness--I can’t compare between the world of the perm and the CP because he hasn’t detailed what his world looks like. Aziz speaks to the NIT providing 1500 a month, but depending on what the living wage amounts to, that could either exceed or not meet that level, each of which would have drastically different worlds, and different ramifications for unemployment, firm and employee motivation and economic effects. This means I can’t do effective comparison, because his 2ar could always delink, which kills substantive engagement. Abuse supercharged by the fact this is my only speech on the issue and he gets the first and last words.

#### For the NIT to work, it must be done alone—other forms of government intervention like the living wage would sandbag it. Humphries

This policy will not work, however, if the current bloated levels of public forced redistribution are maintained. Milton Friedman has long advocated an NIT, but has opposed such a policy as an addition to current welfare instead of a replacement. Charles Murray also outlines how an overly generous NIT can led to perverse outcomes, and simply reinforce the welfarestate. 13 Such warnings should not be dismissed lightly,and highlight the need to promote a minimal and simple NIT, against the pressures of the welfare lobby. The benefits described above are dependent on a willingness to undertake fundamental reform of the welfare sector, challenging previously held beliefs in the welfare state and providing only a limited safety net toachieve real outcomes in a more efficient manner

#### Any risk of link to a net benefit is a Disad to the perm, but specifically, attempting to perm the CP causes the aff to bite worse into cap—doing the aff and attempting to engage in the alternative moots any risk of solvency. Zizek 4

#### (Slavoj, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University, “Iraq: The Borrowed Kettle” P. 71-73)

The stance of simply condemning the postmodern Left for its accommodation, however, is also false, since one should ask the obvious difficult question: what, in fact, was the alternative? If today’s ‘post-politics’ is opportunistic pragmatism with no principles, then the predominant leftist reaction to it can be aptly characterized as ‘principled opportunism’: one simply sticks to the old formulae (defence of the welfare state, and so on) and calls them ‘principles’, dispensing with the detailed analysis of how the situation ahs changed – and thus retaining one’s position of Beautiful Soul. The inherent stupidity of the ‘principled’ Left is clearly discernible in its standard criticism of any analysis which proposes a more complex picture of criticism of any analysis which proposes a more complex picture of the situation, renouncing any simple prescriptions on how to act: ‘there is no clear political stance involved in your theory’ – and this from people with no stance but their ‘principled opportunism’. Against such a stance, one should have the courage to affirm that, in a situation like today’s, the only way really to remain open to a revolutionary opportunity is to renounce facile calls to direct action, which necessarily involve us in an activity where things change so that the totality remains the same. Today’s predicament is that, if we succumb to the urge of directly ‘doing something’ (engaging in the anti-globalist struggle, helping the poor…), we will certainly and undoubtedly contribute to the reproduction of the existing order. The only way to lay the foundations for a true, radical change is to withdraw from the compulsion to act, to ‘do nothing’ – thus opening up the space for a different kind of activity.

## A2 Working Disincentive

**Turn:** the CP doesn’t cause a working disincentive and actually *increases* incentive to start new jobs and companies as well as decreasing costs. **Parramore**

<http://www.salon.com/2014/03/19/5_reasons_to_consider_a_no_strings_attached_basic_income_for_all_americans_partner/> 5 reasons to consider a no-strings-attached, basic income for all Americans [LYNN STUART PARRAMORE](http://www.salon.com/writer/lynn_stuart_parramore/), ALTERNET. Salon Magazine. WEDNESDAY, MAR 19, 2014 05:00 AM PDT

But wait, wouldn’t people get lazy if they had a basic income? One of the things the Mincome researchers wanted to know was whether a guaranteed basic income would cause people to stop working. Despite all the dire predictions that had circulated in academic literature before the experiment, **the Mincome effect on number of hours worked was actually quite small — hours dropped 1 percent for men, 3 percent for married women and 5 percent for unmarried women. The decrease in hours was mostly the result of people taking the time to raise newborns, care for family members, and pursue their education** — ***people did not cut back on work just to loaf around.* In addition to activities which would serve as economic investments for the future, the experiment also resulted in things like fewer hospital visits and illnesses, all of which reduce public health costs. Many argue that a guaranteed basic income is also potentially good for entrepreneurship, making it easier for people to start a small business or switch careers.**

**Turn:** the CP encourages people to work- also solves for harms in squo. **Francis**

David R. Francis The Earned Income Tax Credit Raises Employment- The National Bureau of Economic Research

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), a federal program that provided 22 million American families with children a total of $34 billion in cash assistance in 2003, accomplishes its stated goals. **It** **not only provides low-income workers**, including many who are poor, **with extra income through tax refunds**. This largest federal cash transfer program also **successfully meets its explicit goal of encouraging low-income parents to go to work by**, in effect, **lowering their tax rate and providing a financial bonus for that work effort.** It has been especially effective in encouraging single parents, particularly women, to obtain employment. In **Behavioral Responses to Taxes: Lessons from the EITC and Labor Supply** (NBER Working Paper No.[11729](http://www.nber.org/papers/w11729)), NBER researchers **Nada Eissa** and **Hilary Hoynes** review a large number of economic studies of the EITC and conclude that the main lesson from the accumulated evidence is that real responses to taxes are important. The second lesson is that, while the EITC stimulates people to join the work force, **there is no evidence that it prompts them to work fewer hours.** **This difference, the authors write, "has several important implications for the design of tax-transfer programs and the welfare evaluation of taxation."**

The CP doesn’t cause a working disincentive. **John Aziz writes**

Aziz, John. [Economics and Business Correspondent, TheWeek.com] “There is a Better Alternative to Raising the Minimum Wage.” *The Week*, December 6, 2013. <http://theweek.com/article/index/253795/there-is-a-better-alternative-to-raising-the-minimum-wage>

**The most widespread criticism of basic income policies tends to be that they might encourage laziness.** If you don’t have to work for a living, why would you work at all? **But I don’t think this stands up to the evidence — America already has a welfare state — and there are still more people looking for jobs than there are jobs available.** **A basic income is basic. It does not make you rich or successful — it simply ensures a minimum standard, with a minimum of bureaucracy and without setting any price controls. People would still have many personal and financial incentives to work and to become entrepreneurs. If anything, the fact that there is no longer a minimum wage would probably create more employment, not less.**

## A2 Econ Collapse

1. NIT increases economic growth—this straight turns the aff. **Parramore[[9]](#footnote-9)**

**A basic guaranteed income** has the potential to positively impact the economy in several ways, which is why economists from John Kenneth Galbraith to Milton Friedman have advocated it. For one thing, it **could help solve the problem of demand. The great driver of the economy** in a capitalist system **is something economists call “aggregate demand.”** The Econ 101 lesson is simple: **when ordinary people have money in their pockets, they spend it on goods and services, which in turn allows businesses to thrive because they are able to invest and to hire more people.** Proponents argue that a basic **guaranteed income would increase demand, which would help the economy to prosper.**

Also, because the NIT solves poverty best, that means a significant internal link in aff’s world is solved for, so econ does even better.

1. His indict is exaggerated—the CP won’t cost too much. **Bruenig and Stoker**

**How to Cut the Poverty Rate in Half (It's Easy) By sending every adult and child $3,000 a year, the government could achieve historic poverty reductions. Think of it as Social Security for all, not just the elderly.**[**MATT BRUENIG AND ELIZABETH STOKER**](http://www.theatlantic.com/matt-bruenig-and-elizabeth-stoker/) **OCT 29 2013, 3:58 PM** [**http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/10/how-to-cut-the-poverty-rate-in-half-its-easy/280971/?single\_page=true**](http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/10/how-to-cut-the-poverty-rate-in-half-its-easy/280971/?single_page=true) **The Atlantic Magazine Business Section**

The upside of giving everybody about $3,000 is that it’s a very easy policy to run and a surefire way to cut poverty in half. But it's a large program: it would require about $907 billion in 2012, or 5.6 percent of the nation’s GDP. (**In a real implementation, we might exclude the**[**more than 45 million Americans receiving OASI Social Security benefits**](http://www.ssa.gov/oact/STATS/OASDIbenies.html)**from a basic income, bringing the cost down substantially.**) **Could we afford it? Sure. For starters, we could raises taxes, first on the rich, who would pay more in new taxes than they would receive in basic income, and then on lower-middle class and poor families, who would come out ahead. There is also plenty of room to cut tax expenditures on homeowners, personal retirement accounts, capital gains exclusions at death, and exclusions on annuity investment returns. This submerged welfare state for the affluent costs hundreds of billions of dollars each year. There is also the matter of the $700 billion military budget, which could take some trimming.**

1. Call for the solvency advocate—we fund the CP by removing other welfare programs that aren’t as useful which are solved for by the CP, and by taxes on higher income groups

## Cap FLs

### A2 Small Steps

1. Aff’s small steps are coopted and useless—they don’t even link as a form of rejection. We need to reject all instances of cap, especially true for the wage system, the material foundation for the commodification of labor to the capitalist system. But even if small steps are sometimes useful, only complete rejection like the CP have effect in context of the wage system to challenge cap.
2. TURN--The institution of the living wage functions as a palliative that temporarily appeases the masses to delay revolution

Eagleton 11 – prominent British literary theorist, critic and public intellectual. He is currently Distinguished Professor of English Literature at Lancaster University, Professor of Cultural Theory at the National University of Ireland and Distinguished Visiting Professor of English Literature at The University of Notre Dame

(Eagleton, Terry. “Why Marx Was Right.” 2011 by Yale University. New Haven and London)

He is talking, then, about what free men and women are bound to do under certain circumstances. But this is surely a contradiction, since freedom means that there is nothing that you are bound to do. You are not bound to devour a succulent pork chop if your guts are being wrenched by agonizing hunger pains. As a devout Muslim, you might prefer to die. If there is only one course of action I can possibly take, and if it is impossible for me not to take it, then in that situation I am not free. Capitalism may beteeteringon the verge of ruin, but it may not be socialism that replaces it. It may be fascism, or barbarism. Perhaps the working class will betoo enfeebled anddemoralized by thecrumbling ofthe system to act constructively. In an uncharacteristically gloomy moment, Marx reflects that the class strugglemay result in the ‘‘common ruination’’ of the contending classes. Or—a possibility that he could not fully anticipate—the systemmightfend off political insurrection by reform. Social democracy is one bulwark between itself and disaster. In this way**,** the surplusreapedfrom developed productive forces can be used to buy off revolution, which does not fit at all neatly into Marx’s historical scheme. He seems to have believed that capitalist prosperity can only be temporary; thatthe system will eventually founder; and that the working class will then inevitably rise up and take it over. But this, for one thing, passes over the many ways (much more sophisticated in our own day than in Marx’s) in which even a capitalism in crisis can continue to secure the consent of its citizens. Marx did not have Fox News and the Daily Mail to reckon with.

1. Look to Wolff and Jette—that shows you that allowing ourselves to get more comfortable in a capitalistic society only reentrenches the domination.

### More Cap Links

#### (\_\_) A living wage fosters dependency of the worker on his or her job, due to increased financial benefits. This means that capitalism is re-entrenched because the worker’s power is lost to the employers. Jette 14

Dr Matt Jette (PhD Harvard in Political Science), “Mobility and Walmart” December 2014

The decline in mobility is caused by many factors, some mentioned above and still others not yet explored. An explanation though contains within it a more nuanced answer. Beginning in post-World War II America, business in their aim to recruit workers began to offer benefits, namely health care benefits. Soon these benefits expanding to financial instruments, including for example the 401k or pension plans. Workers began to find reason to remain put and to attempt to move up through the proverbial ranks of industry, much like their fathers. What resulted in part was the decline in incentive to reward more and more workers who have decided to stay in place. Employers now could be mobile themselves, thanks to tax incentives and competition between the states, while having the certainty that workers (because education has become more and more standardized) would essentially be mirrored images across communities. The result is that workers become anchored and less powerful, while industry more mobile and wealthy. The new healthcare law (The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act - PP-ACA) does not represent government intervention over the lives of people. Rather, the fight against it comes from the realization that if given the power to move across jobs, for they would no longer be attached to benefits, would inherently result in an [workers would have increased] increase in power for the worker at the expense of industry. Although the discussion is tailored in terms of government inefficiencies or control, these are mere representations geared to drive the people against, not government, but against themselves. Making the people less mobile increases their dependency.

No possibility to deny: this is especially true when increases in the living wage benefit most large corporations. Anthony 14

Anthony, Charles 2/3/14 “Minimum Wages Increases—the NeoCon Ruse” http://www.thepolitic.com/archives/2014/02/03/minimum-wage-increases-the-neo-con-ruse/

As I was rooting through [Rabble, a tiny gem of wisdom twinkled](http://rabble.ca/blogs/bloggers/trish-hennessy/2014/01/14-minimum-wage-could-put-ontario-on-right-side-history) from way at the bottom of a comment by a character called fortunate: “Again, [raising the minimum wage] may not be a huge deal for a large company, but for a mom and pop convenience store running 24/7, it will add up, and mom and pop will be staffing the front counter more hours per week, and sending the employee home with less hours per week.” He gets it. Large corporations love minimum wage increases because they will always be able to survive the economy. Small businesses operating at the margin get bought by large corporations or go under. Minimum wage increase legislation is an astonishing socio-economic phenomenon because it plays on the stupidity and selfishness of the common socialists to gain popular support but the effect is the exact nightmare feared by socialists: ever increasing concentrations of property ownership in the hands of a rich elite.

#### (\_\_) Rather than breaking down capitalism, the living wage only increases the comfort and ability for the working class to participate in a fully tyrannical capitalistic society. Jette 14

Dr Matt Jette (PhD Harvard in Political Science), “Mobility and Walmart” December 2014

The difference between the haves and have-nots has steadily increased in the United States, particularly since the 1970s. In fact, the share of wealth owned by the top 1% is approaching early twentieth century levels. The level of income inequality has drawn criticism and dire warnings from both academic and economic “truth tellers.” Although descriptive analysis on the causes and consequences of income inequality is important, it is not what is needed most. Rather, a normative investigation is required. The main issue is not that income inequality exists, but rather it has remained dormant in the American mind. The answer I believe is the “Walmart Effect.” The change most important [change] in the American economy over the past several decades is arguably the change in the type of goods that drive the American economy itself. Whereas America’s post World War II economy saw a mass increase in the manufacturing of durable goods, today’s economy is dominated by the reliance on non-durable good production. This trend highlight[ing]s the change in the types of jobs created (i.e., part time and service jobs versus full time and manufacturing jobs) as well as the velocity of product creation and consumption. Adding to this change is the increase in the sophistication of persuasion tools used by industry, mystical rational policymaking, and the growing complexity of society. Consumers then become educated not to notice inequality in its true form, but are made aware of it through small and seemingly unconnected pieces of information. So, although pay checks are smaller products are still purchased because the cost of producing these products has declined at a similar rate as the average American worker’s paycheck. Unfortunately, this has come at the expense of both our understanding and long term economic welfare and interest. Walmart does not represent what is evil in society, for it only sells the products we demand. Rather, we are ourselves the product, manufactured by industry mouthpieces and wrapped and sold within rising expectations. The buyer of our need to mask our own ignorance and avoidance is none other than…Walmart.

The affirmative’s efforts at equality through a living wage are a ruse of the capitalistic mechanism – this form of hegemony guarantees the continuation of the structural conditions which breed inequality and the call for a living wage – the extension of increased wages only strengthens the powers that be – the affirmatives discussion must be de-centered from legal apparatus before a discussion on equality can truly begin

**Arrigo**, Bruce and Williams, Christopher (California School of Professional Psychology), **2000** “The (Im) Possibility of Democratic Justice and the "Gift" of the Majority.” Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice.

The impediments to establishing democratic justice in contemporary American society have caused a national paralysis; one that has recklessly spawned an aporetic1 existence for minorities. **The entrenched ideological complexities afflicting under nonrepresented groups** (e.g., poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, crime) **at the hands of political,** legal, cultural, **and economic power elites have produced counterfeit**, perhaps even fraudulent, **efforts at reform**: Discrimination and inequality in opportunity prevail (e.g., Lynch & Patterson, 1996). **The misguided and futile initiatives of the state**, in pursuit of transcending this public affairs crisis, **have fostered** reification, that is, **a reinforcement of divisiveness**. This time, however, minority groups compete with one another for recognition, affirmation, and identity in the national collective psyche (Rosenfeld, 1993). **What ensues by** way of **state effort**, though, **is a** contemporaneous **sense of equality for all and a near imperceptible endorsement of inequality**; a silent conviction **that the majority still retains power. The “gift” of equality, procured through state legislative enactments as an emblem of** democratic **justice, embodies true** (legitimated**) power that remains** nervously **secure in the hands of the majority. The** ostensible **empowerment** of minority groups **is a facade; it is the ruse of the majority gift**. What exists, in fact, is a simulacrum (Baudrillard, 1981, 1983) of equality (and by extension, democratic justice): a pseudo-sign image (a hypertext or simulation) of real sociopolitical progress. For the future relationship between equality and the social to more fully embrace minority sensibilities, calculated legal reform efforts in the name of equality must be displaced and the rule and authority of the status quo must be decentered. Imaginable, calculable equality is self-limiting and self-referential. Ultimately, it is always (at least) one step removed from true equality and, therefore, true justice. **The ruse of the majority gift currently operates under the assumption of a presumed empowerment**, which it confers on minority populations. Yet, the presented power is itself circumscribed by the stifling horizons of majority rule with their effects. Thus, **the gift can only be construed as** falsely eudemonic**: A**n avaricious, although insatiable, **pursuit of** narcissistic **legitimacy supporting majority directives**. The commission (bestowal) of power to minority groups or citizens through prevailing state reformatory efforts underscores a polemic with implications for public affairs and civic life. We contend that the avenir (i.e., the “to come”) of equality as an (in)calculable, (un)recognizable destination in search of democratic justice is needed. However, we argue that this displacement of equality is unattainable if prevailing juridico-ethicopolitical conditions (and societal consciousness pertaining to them) remain fixed, stagnant, and immutable. In this article, we will demonstrate how the gift of the majority is problematic**, producing,** as it must, a narcissistichegemony,that is, **a sustained empowering of the privileged, a constant relegitimation of the powerful.** Relying on Derrida’s postmodern critique of Eurocentric logic and thought, we will show how complicated and fragmented the question of establishing democratic justice is in Western cultures, especially in American society. We will argue that **what is needed is a relocation of the debate about justice and difference from the circumscribed boundaries of legal** redistributive **discourse on equality to the more encompassing context of alterity, undecidability, [and] cultural plurality,** and affirmative postmodern thought.

## Freedom FLs

### A2 Strict Impossibility

1. There’s no link between having to work and receiving basic needs. Danaker 15 explicates Maskivker:

Maskivker has a very simply reply to this version of the objection. She holds that premise (7) [We have to work in order to secure these basic needs] is false. Not all activities that are conducive to our survival are inevitable. At one point in time, we had to take the furs and hides of animals in order to stay warm enough to survive. We no longer have to do this. The connection between survival and procuring the furs and hides of animals has been severed. The same could happen to the connection between work and our basic needs. Indeed, it is arguable that we no longer need to work all that much to secure our basic needs. There are many labour saving devices in manufacturing and agriculture (and there are soon to be more) that obviate the need for work. And yet the social demand for work has, for some reason, not diminished. Surely this doesn’t have to be the case? Surely we could allow more machines to secure our basic needs?

### A2 Collective Action

1. Nonresponsive—the existence of a right isn’t dependent on whether universal exercising of that right leads to negative outcomes. We have a right to not have children, even though if everyone did that, humanity would go extinct
2. Empirically denied—Parramore and Francis show that people still will work anyway, the difference is that now it isn’t coercive because they didn’t have to work.
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